

MULLILINGUALISM AS PSYCHOSOCIAL FACTOR OF CULTURAL VALUE ORIENTATIONS (IN TERMS OF YOUNG PEOPLE OF TR)

Edward Grigoryevich Volchkov

Kazan Federal University, Institute of Psychology and Education,
Mezhlauka Street, 1, Kazan, 420021, Tatarstan (RUSSIA)

DOI: 10.7813/jll.2015/6-2/12

Received: 04 Dec, 2014

Accepted: 02 Feb, 2015

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the role and value of multilingualism as psychological and cultural value orientations. The problem presents a matter of important and topical interest for a multiethnic region as Tatarstan. If the schools of Tatarstan are oriented at targeted tolerance formation of a student on the basis of multilingual model of education then a higher educational establishment does not follow the same pattern. Lack of due multilingual grounding at higher school brings to contradictoriness and multiplicity of interpretation of cultural value orientations among the youth of Tatarstan. We have chosen the methods adapted by G.U. Soldatova [5] «Cultural value differential» for cross-cultural study of cultural value orientations of the Russians and the Tatars of the Tatar Republic.

Findings show that interethnic relations among young people carry ambiguous reference. It is evident from analyzing the investigation results that the Russians and the Tatars are not ready for positive interethnic relations with each other, in particular, it is explicitly exhibited among the representatives of Tatar intelligentsia, at time in the past, emigrated from countryside, assimilated into urbanized bilingual environment and educated at municipal higher school.

We agree soundly that this factor is indicative of interethnic relation decay. It is obvious that tolerant, good-neighbourly relations that were inherent in schooling has not been formed adequately by higher school's bilingual environment in that section of young people. In conclusion, analyzing multilingualism influence on formation of cultural value orientation of young people, it is important to notice that possible field of applying findings for Tatarstan political and educational institutes in determination of strategy of interpersonal communication aimed at tension reducing in the Republic is favourable at present.

The bilingual as well as monolingual Russian-Tatar students (village youth and city dwellers) of 22-25 took place in the experiment.

Key words: cultural value orientation, bilingualism, monolingualism, tolerance (intolerance), ethnicity, self-consciousness, socialization

1. INTRODUCTION

The problems of multilingualism and interethnic interaction is rather actual problem for the Tatar Republic. In multinational republic implementation of multinational language policy keeps remaining the major task in new social realities. When generating educating systems in the regions of Tatarstan where the representatives of various nations reside, the significant and at the same time complicated task of language problems harmonization arises.

In the schools of the Tatar Republic where the nations representatives living in this region study simultaneously the dedicated formation of tolerance of student's personality influenced by multilingualism is going on. By and large, it is achieved by means of realization of educational multilingual pattern in the republic in which the ethno-cultural component that has, in our view, specific feature is widely represented.

Thus, socialization of student's personality, his formation is going on in multilingual environment and under its persistent tolerant influence in many ways.

The role and significance of such education in terms of schooling are proved by E.G. Volchkova's, Ye.E. Volchkova's investigations [1]: graduates from school are tolerant, ready for perception of «the different» and for interethnic communication.

Unfortunately, this educational pattern, in our opinion, does not have so significant effect afterwards – at higher school. It is disappearing and practically coming to nothing. This pattern partially manifests itself in studying the Tatar language as the second state language. It cannot but affect the formation of misrepresented cultural value orientations of young people of the Tatar Republic. Cultural value orientations of the Tatar young people carry, in our view, contradictory character that lies in diverse influence of multilingualism on them. It has noticeable effect mainly on the youth residing in bilingual as well as multilingual environment. Contradictory character of cultural value orientation is the result of qualitative emotional process of individuals' self-determination in social space in regard to the other ethnos. It is not only awareness of their ethnic identity but evaluation of it and emotional experience as well. According to L.S. Vygotsky, experience is «a child's inner attitude toward this or that real moment» [2]. Value orientations is an aspect of people's normative role-playing behavior. Here it is implied strategic determinants of people having been entrenched in a certain cultural environment for centuries. These definitions are oriented towards the study of common cultural phenomenon in which moral-oriented and problem instructive aspects are singled out[3].

Cultural values take place mostly in realization of the aspect of human activity: its components are more stable, dynamics of changes becomes slower than dynamics of the elements of value orientations. Manifestations of value orientations as well as cultural values are treated at the same time as strong factors of motivation of human cultural behavior: they serve as stimuli for gaining various aims. Standards of cultural evaluation, hierarchy of essential goals and choice of their achievement methods become formed by means of value orientations and cultural values. Forms of realization of stated functions in both cases are performed differently. At the same time, according to L.F. Bayanova, «every culture has cultural

norms. A culture representative strives for corresponding to normative context, but a person targets at transformations of culture that is represented with a unique norm set by him» [4].

2. RESULTS

For hypothesis testing we have carried out a pilot experiment with 60 participants (15 Tatars – bilinguals, 15 Tatars – monolinguals, 15 Russians – bilinguals, 15 Russians – monolinguals). The participants were graduate students (O3O) having practical work in the field and representing young group of population. The age of students under consideration was 22-25 years old. Not large sample accounts for by our having conducted the pilot questionnaire survey, necessary for determining on a strategy and tactics for further investigation.

For cross-cultural investigation of cultural value orientations of the Russians and the Tatars we have chosen the method adapted by G.U. Soldatova [5] «Cultural value differential».

In continuum of psychological universal phenomenon «collectivism – individualism» four groups of value orientations are considered: group (self) orientation, social changes orientation, orientation to interethnic interaction, orientation toward power.

We have dwelt only on the third group of value orientations since orientation toward interethnic interaction acts as the most important means of socialization, extends ethnics' opportunities in knowledge acquisition about peculiarities of their and neighbouring cultures, promotes the development of interethnic understanding.

Scale intervals from 1 to 4 was applied for the answers. Quality factor from 0 to 1 is determined by the formulae:

$Q = \frac{1}{6}(300 - 3Q_1 - Q_2 + Q_3 + 3Q_4)$, where Q_1 – the quality is not explicit; Q_2 – quality is conveyed poor; Q_3 – average quality conveying качества; Q_4 – quality is conveyed to the full.

The central rank among ethno social perception is held by images of native and other ethnic groups that present the main meaning of ethnic identity as cognitive motivational core of ethnic self-consciousness and implicitly present individual relations in interethnic contacts. The ethnophor subconsciously finds his position in multiethnic environment and constructs an algorithm of behavior in and out of the group. He creates an image of psychosocial safety and stability of life through the steadiness of his positive ethnoidentity.

General results are in table 1.

Table 1. Orientation of the young people of Tatarstan to interethnic interaction

Indicators	Bilinguals		Monolinguals	
	The Russians about the Tatars	The Tatars about the Russians	The Russians about the Tatars	The Tatars about the Russians
tolerance	0,7	0,4	0,8	0,8
intolerance	0,4	0,3	0,2	0,2
warmth	0,5	0,4	0,8	0,5
coldness	0,2	0,2	0,3	0,3
compliance	0,5	0,1	0,4	0,5
rivalry	0,5	0,2	0,4	0,4

3. DISCUSSION

On the basis of analysed data that are presented in the table one can state that residing in monolingual environment has relative isolation of rural population from cross-cultural information portraying neighbouring nation in idealized positive light. One can observe it from the received data: people, living in monolingual surrounding, expressed appreciation of ethnic neighbor.

When analyzing the results one can see that the Russians and the Tatars are not ready for positive interethnic interaction with each other, especially it is explicitly expressed by the representatives of the Tatar intelligentsia emigrated from rural areas in the past, assimilated in urbanized bilingual environment and educated at a municipal higher educational establishment. In our point of view, it is a striking example of a certain decay of the level of interethnic interaction. It is obvious that the bilingual environment of higher educational establishment has not formed rather tolerant, good-neighbourly relations inherent in schooling in this group of young people.

The same we observe among urban bilingual intelligentsia. They have distance in relation to each other, reluctance of close ethnocontact relationship and some inconsistency. Thus, on the one hand, usual tolerance, peacefulness and warmth to the ethnic neighbor (the Russians) are observed, in reality the Tatars give undervaluation to the Russians due to the ethnic interaction data defining them as distance oriented in relation to the neighbor group. It is the evidence of hidden non-acceptance of principles, everyday values of the Russians and some distance from the neighbor nation. We think that it is connected with so called kindly disposed or flexible ethnocentrism, that means impartial assessment of the group quality, and with an attempt to understand the features of another [6].

In this way, the wider is the spectrum of cultural value orientations of ethnophor, the longer he lives in bilingual surrounding. Multilingual rural intelligentsia is more tolerant to the speaking another language while citizens attitude «with coldness» to the individuals of another nation. The investigation by E.G. Volchkova supports this fact. Thus, the author notices that «the rural Tatars whose socialization was in monolingual environment manifest their ethnic identification stronger» [7].

The Tatars think that the Russians don't strive for achieving their goals in different spheres of live activity by which they demonstrate that the Russians are passive not friendly rivalry [motivation of achieving: compliance – 0,1 – rivalry – 0,2].

Rivalry is always an integral part of urbanization. It concerns more the Tatars being in bilingual environment. In the Russians' opinion, such quality as rivalry is highly expressed in the Tatar nationality. M.Mid wrote «every individual of the group is confident in his own position being different from group position and is a vivid example of bearer of collective values that serve in this case as the source of information about either of the culture» [8].

Inhabitants of villages and towns are inclined to cooperation more than city inhabitants.

Unlike the representatives of the Russian and the Tatar bilingual intelligentsia, ethnophors specializing in monolingual environment are drawn more toward cross-cultural communication with the neighboring people. The Russian rural youth gets emotionally ready for interethnic communication with neighboring nation. This factor is indicative of

scholarship, high culture and striving for «acceptance of the other culture» and the neighboring nation. Socialized in monolingual environment where there is no cross-cultural relations, the Russian and the Tatar ethnophors do not feel and face with international inner conflicts. These all leads to positive interethnic interaction and relationship within titular ethnic group of Tatarstan.

So, we see antagonisms in the character of interethnic interaction among the bilingual and monolingual youth. Moreover, among bilingual young people it is observed the decay and intolerance in their relations [0,2; 0,3], and among the monolinguals we observe the opposite [0,8; 0,4], and, at the same time notice some coldness in relations [0,2; 0,4; 0,3]. Similar coldness we notice in motivation of achieving goals (compliance - rivalry), that indicates to interethnic tolerance [0,4; 0,5].

In other words, cultural value orientations, as well as ethnical identity heavily depend upon not only the nearest surrounding but also the wider [9]. It makes sense to the fact whether a person lives either in polyethnic or monoethnic environment. Besides, Phinney argues «that is all significant in situations in which two or more ethnic groups correlate » [10].

4. SUMMARY

1. Family is the basis of ethnic formation in which socialization by means of the language begins.
2. In the process of socialization a personality forms. Bilingualism broadens the opportunities of acquiring by ethnophor knowledge about features of his native and neighboring culture.
3. Cultural value orientations are clearly realized if a person specializes in polyethnic culture.

COMMENDATION

The work was performed in terms of implementation «The plan of activities on realization of the Program of competitive recovery of FGAOU VPO « K(P) FU» among the leading world scientific-educational centers for 2013 – 2020».

REFERENCES

1. Волчков Э.Г., Волčkова Е.Э. Многоязычная модель образования как условия развития толерантности школьников (на материале республики Татарстан). Реальность этноса. Образование и проблемы межэтнической коммуникации. Материалы IV научно-практической конференции. Санкт-Петербург, 17-20 апреля 2002 (стр.322-323)
2. Выготский Л.С., Детская психологи. 1984 соб.соч: в 6 т., т.4. – С. 382
3. Scheff. T.J. Academic Gangs, Crime; Law and Social change / T.J. Scheff// 1995. - №23. – P.157-162.
4. Baynova, L.F. (2011) Hamlet as a reflection of psychological characteristics according to L.S. Vygotsky Voprosy Psikhologii (6), pp. 77-83.
5. Солдатова Г.У. Психология межэтнической напряженности. М., 1998-с.386.
6. Brewer, M.B., Campbell D.T. Ethnocentrism and intergroup attitudes: East African evidence. N. Y., 1976.
7. Volchkov, E.G. The empiric study of ethnic identity of the Tatar (based on the Republic of Tatarstan). Life Sci. J 2014; 11 (9s):129-132] (ISSN:1097-8135).<http://www.lifesciencesite.com>.24.
8. Mead, M. National Character. In: Kroebe A. K. (ed.). Anthropology Today/ - Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1953. – 645 p.
9. Стефаненко Т.Г. Этнопсихология. Учебник М.: аист пресс, 2009.-с.139.
10. Phinney, J.S. Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research // Psychological Bulletin. 1990. Vol. 108. P. 499-514, - С. 501